

REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 29, 2000 with claims 1-19. Claims 1, 17 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-17 and 19 remain pending, and claims 1, 17 and 19 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding final Office Action dated October 27, 2006, the Examiner: (I) rejected claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,963,909 to Warren et al. (hereinafter "Warren").


With regard to the rejection of claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Warren, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 17 and 19 as suggested by the Examiner. Independent claims 1, 17 and 19 have been amended to recite that the subset of the plurality of cryptographic token keys comprise fewer cryptographic token keys than the plurality of cryptographic token keys. Support for this amendment can be found on page 4, lines 7-11, page 11, lines 5-10 and page 12, lines 6-11 of the specification.

Warren discloses the reproduction of a full multimedia signal through the use of multimedia frames and encryption keys. However, Warren fails to specifically enable the receiving client to access only a selected portion of the media as defined by the sending server, in accordance with an access status of the receiving client. Warren also fails to disclose transferring the subset of the plurality of cryptographic token keys from the sending server to the receiving client, wherein non-selected cryptographic token keys are not transferred to the receiving client as defined by the sending server, in accordance with the access status of the receiving client, and wherein the subset of the plurality of cryptographic token keys comprise fewer cryptographic token keys than the plurality of cryptographic token keys.

Dependent claims 2-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1, and also contain patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-17 and 19 are on condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: November 30, 2006

Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547